UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

Ethics and Propaganda

By EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

The Value of a Liberal Church to the Community

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Law and Progress

By ROBERT WHITAKER

Book Reviews

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

VOLUME CIV | NUMBER 20

Chicago, February 3, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
FRANCIS NEILSON — LOUIS L. MANN — CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. G. Leonard, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors
W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthèeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

Five Articles on Russia

by

Anna Louise Strong

Miss Strong has lived in Russia for a large part of every year since the Revolution in 1917. She has traveled in every part of the country, and has crossed Siberia and China. She knows all the leaders of the Soviet Republic and is in intimate touch with all political and social movements. These articles are written from Russia where she is now residing.

The subjects of this special series of articles are as follows:

The Fighting Farmers of Russia.
The Year of the Great "Breakover" in Russia.
Soviet Rulers on Vacation.
Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies.
Moving Out from the Ranks in Russia, or Raising Up Managers.

These five articles will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for February 24.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 307
Ethics and Propaganda—EDMUND B. CHAFFEE 309
Jottings—J. H. H. 312
ARTICLES—
The Value of a Liberal Church to the Community—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 312
Law and Progress—ROBERT WHITAKER 316
POETRY—
My Prayer for India—RABINDRANATH TAGORE 307
Trumpets on New Horizons:
In Their Own Image—KATHLEEN MILLAY ... 315
My Ego—ELI GREIFER 315
Ellis Island Episode—MARGARETTE BALL DICKSON 315
THE STUDY TABLE
Book Reviews by JOHN HAYNES HOLMES:
Conscientious Objectors in the Great War ... 317
An Anthology of Great Poets 318
THE FIELD—
Novel By-Way Cruise Through Japan—Directed by DR. FREDERICK STARR 319
The War Against Alcohol 319

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1930 NUMBER 20

MY PRAYER FOR INDIA

What is my longing, my dream, my prayer, *for my country, my beloved India?*
I dream of her. I fervently pray for her, that she may no longer be *in bondage to strangers;*
But that she may be *free!*
Free to follow her own *high ideals:*
Free to accomplish her own *important mission in the world:*
Free to fill her own *God-given place among the great nations!*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

It might be well for the delegates at the Naval Conference in London to make up their minds, before they proceed much further, whether they have met to accomplish some limitation or reduction of armaments, or to effect some financial economies. The British Labor Party, we are told, want to get rid of battleships, because by saving the enormous cost of these vessels, they can find money for handling the unemployment problem in the United Kingdom. Other nations are similarly minded, though it is said that the United States is still desirous of having some of these armed leviathans lying in her navy yards. But what has the elimination of battleships got to do with the problem of armaments? What assurance is there that, if great sums of money are saved on this item of a naval program, these sums will not be promptly used on other much more modern items, such as submarines and bombing-planes? The point is that armaments today have moved beyond the battleship era, just as they have moved beyond the ship-of-the-line era. War on the sea is not going to be fought any longer with such weapons, any more than they are going to be fought on the land with cavalry. To be sure, the naval mind still thinks in terms of battleships, just as the military mind still thinks in terms of cavalry. Both minds are impenetrably and permanently stupid! But the scientific mind is going to dominate the next war, just as it began at the end to dominate the last war. And the people, with a kind of inspired common-sense, know this fact. Therefore, whatever the money saved on the battleship account, they are not going to be satisfied with any such accomplishment as this. The great powers have solemnly agreed together to renounce war. If they mean business they will at least begin the work of getting rid of the weapons with which war is fought today. The London Conference is just assembling as this editorial is being written. When the editorial is printed, the Conference will have been two weeks in session. It should be evident by that time whether the assembled statesmen are interested in money or peace.

That was a remarkable thing which took place at The Hague—at the conference on reparation payments under the Young Plan. What about sanctions, the application of force, if Germany deliberately defaults under the Plan? How is France or any other nation to know whether Germany is deliberately defaulting or is just unable to meet the payments, as seems altogether likely? These are ticklish questions; such questions have led to war often enough in the past. But at this Hague Conference resort was had to the World Court. Whether on any occasion of failure the German government is to be regarded as consciously destroying the Young Plan, is to be left to the Court for determination. If the Court rules in the affirmative, then the French are to be at liberty to use the "sanctions" provided in the Versailles Treaty (worse luck!), and Germany agrees not to regard this as an act of war. If Germany can prove her case of inability, on the other hand, she is to be safe from all armed pressure. This is what is going to happen eventually, of course, for the Young Plan is just as impossible as the Dawes Plan. Which means in this case that Europe is going to be saved the horror of war over reparation defaults, or even the obscenity of another Ruhr invasion! The gain to both nations is obvious. Germany gains security against French arrogance and aggression; France on the other hand gains immunity from charges of militarism and violence. But the chief gainer is the World Court, which wins enormous prestige by being made arbiter in a matter of such importance in the existing European situation. Also the cause of peace! Here is another long step toward the shining goal of settling disputes between nations, even big disputes, by reason and goodwill instead of by resort to arms. It is not the whole distance to the goal by a good deal—look at the resort to the violences of the Versailles Treaty! But it is a step, and a momentous step. We are on the way!

It has become a fixed habit of the "wets" in this country to point to Canada as the solution of the Prohibition problem. Evidence is abundant that the liquor problem in Canada is not being solved, but on the contrary, is being aggravated by the policy of the Dominion provinces. The famous investigation conducted by the *Christian Science Monitor,* for example, so favorable to the "drys," has never been answered. Our "wet" friends are not interested in facts, and have never undertaken to use them. Their arguments are not arguments, but explosions of temper. There are plenty of persons, however, who are sorely troubled about the liquor problem, and are hungry for real facts and honest opinions. For the benefit of these, whom we believe to be numerous among the readers of this paper, we reprint herewith a report just received from a distinguished journalist of Canada, the editor of the Toronto *Globe,* one of the most influential newspapers in all the Dominion. This gentleman, Mr. Elmore Philpott, replied as follows to seven pertinent questions about what is going on in Canada:

1. Is it your opinion that Government control makes for real temperance? *Reply. No.*
2. Does Government Control decrease or increase the consumption of liquor? *Reply. Liquor consumption has doubled in Ontario in two years.*
3. Does Government control decrease or increase number of drunken drivers of automobiles? *Reply. Drunken drivers have multiplied by ten, while cars doubled.*
4. Have deaths from accidents due to drunken drivers increased under Government control? *Reply. Yes —enormously.*
5. Have industrial accidents decreased under Government control? *Reply. No. Increasing 7% faster than payrolls.*
6. Has Government control eliminated the bootlegger? *Reply. Large bootlegger eliminated, but small bootlegger multiplied.*
7. Has Government control proved of any benefit to the young people? *Reply. No.*

We commend this statement to our "wet" friends. Will their newspapers publish it? Can they themselves answer it?

Military training in our schools and colleges is bad enough for boys, but what are we going to say when this abominable discipline is extended to girls? A nation would seem to be moving fast and far back into the regions of utter barbarism when it takes its young women and attempts to turn them into a tribe of Amazons. And yet this is precisely what this country is undertaking to do in not a few of our so-called institutions of learning. As an example of what we mean, take the following story clipped from the Omaha (Nebraska) *World-Herald* for November 23, 1929:

THE GIRLS ARE IN THE ARMY NOW—NORTH HIGH GIRL PUPILS FORM CADET BATTALION AND WILL BE GIVEN RIFLES—ALL START AS PRIVATES IN THE RANK—FACULTY APPROVES.

A girl battalion that hopes to give the boys' battalion at North High School some keen competition has been organized with 152 girls in the ranks.

As yet no officers have been appointed, nor do the girl cadets have uniforms, but plans are being made to provide both within the near future. It is the first girl battalion to be organized in an Omaha high school, and carries the full backing of the faculty.

The girls plan to hold regular weekly drill just as the boys do, although during this semester, until the project is a little better organized, it will be conducted without rifles. Two cadet captains, John Daum and Robert Fortune of the North Battalion, will be in command.

This is a lovely exhibition for a civilized community, isn't it? Note how this movement for turning girls into soldiers carried "the full backing of the faculty" of the school in question. It had the full backing, also, of the War Department in Washington, we may be sure. Under existing law, to be sure, the War Department is unable officially to sponsor such a piece of savagery as this. But Congressman Collins was undoubtedly correct when he said, in a recent speech in the House anent this incident, that

"the girls will probably be able to borrow the rifles used by the Reserve Officers Training Corps boys and occasionally borrow their best looking officers. After a few more years of boosting the military idea in this country, the ladies may receive further consideration."

Already they are receiving attention in our courts. For is not this arming of our young women for service in the next war the real explanation of the refusal of the courts to grant citizenship to such notable pacifist women as Rosika Schwimmer and Margaret Dorland Webb? Women must fight in this Christian age and country of ours, so willingness to fight must be a condition of citizenship! The only way to stop this villainous thing is to crush military training as one would crush a snake. Wipe it out, root and branch!

Presidential temperaments react differently to the presidential office. Theodore Roosevelt had "a bully time" in the White House, but this has little significance, as "Teddy" had "a bully time" anywhere. Oyster Bay or the River of Doubt, it made no difference; Roosevelt was at home! But few other Presidents have reacted in this way. Most of them have been unhappy, restive, worn. Grover Cleveland, for example, was miserable in Washington. His extreme conscientiousness made his duties a burden alike to body and mind. McKinley was even-tempered, serene, but it was his lot to die from an assassin's bullet. Woodrow Wilson had Cleveland's high sense of duty, but lacked his stolidity of character, and thus wore himself out, and in the end collapsed utterly. Taft was as out of place in the White House as a bull frog in the china closet, and was only saved by his lazy inability ever to discover what it was all about. Now, in his

philosophical old age, the Chief Justice must regard his presidential years as the tragic period of his life. Mr. Harding suffered from an inescapable inferiority complex, as much induced by domestic as by official relations, and not unnaturally he sought relief in debauchery. Mr. Coolidge was perhaps only a little more unhappy in the White House than elsewhere, but he at least had the courage and good sense to escape in time. Now Herbert Hoover is miserable, and talks about the hair shirts that he has to wear as a part of his robes of office. Who would be a president? Everybody! There will never be a lack of candidates for this highest office in the gift of the people. For ambition is still a persistent appetite, and men and women alike are ready to pay a high price to satisfy it.

Do the dead live? This riddle of the ages seems at last to have been answered in the case of the late Clare Briggs, the newspaper artist. This famous and popular creator of "When a Feller Needs a Friend," "Mr. and Mrs.," and other famous comic pictures, died over a month ago, but his drawings keep right on appearing in the newspapers which control his work. Briggs is apparently sketching his pictures now, after death, just as he did so successfully all the while he was lying helpless and pain-wracked in the hospital; and communication between heaven and earth seems to be open and regular. Surely, the continuance of these pictures is sure evidence of the reality of life after death! Or, as some skeptical souls suggest, is some other artist now doing Briggs's work under the latter's name and in close imitation of his style? If so, we have explanation of all the spurious "old masters" in the field of art whose canvasses clutter up the museums and the art shops of the world. It has been said that there are 100 genuine Rembrandts in existence, and that 600 of these are in America. Which is a cynical, as well as humorous way of exclaiming at the vast number of pictures that Rembrandt and other great artists used to paint! But *did* they paint them? On the contrary, it is surmised that most of them did nothing more than sketch them in outline, leaving it to their pupils, who knew their style, to do the actual painting. But does not this Clare Briggs episode present another explanation? When the great artist died, nobody wanted to admit that he was dead. It was anything but profitable to cut off the large income produced by the master's work. So, after his death, his pupils went right on producing his pictures, just as though nothing had happened. And we now have the flood of paintings bearing the great man's name which still are so enormously profitable to dealers. Well, well! There's nothing new under the sun.

Ethics and Propaganda

Among the dozens of words and phrases thrown into everyday language by the Great War, such as camouflage, over the top, moppers up, zero hour, fed up and the like, none is more entrenched in our speech than the word "Propaganda." The Great War did not originate the word (it had been used by the Roman Catholic Church years before), but it gave it a conspicuous place in the vocabulary of nearly every man and woman in the Western world, and made it next to impossible to publish a single issue of any newspaper or magazine without using it as a refrain. Indeed, it seems sometimes as if the whole world were engaged in propaganda for or against something. The net result has been that logical arguments and cold facts can now be airily dismissed with a shrug of the shoulders and a whisper of the word, "Propaganda." So it is worth our while to ask what about it? Is it right or wrong? Men and women vitally interested in ethical problems must face the ethics of this matter. This is the purpose of these lines.

It will at the outset be helpful for us to remember that while propaganda may be a new word in the daily vocabulary of ordinary folk, the thing it describes is not new. Herodotus, the historian of the ancient Greeks, describes a propagandist effort made by Themistocles in the Persian War. This old warrior went to the places where drinking water was to be found and wrote upon the stones thereabouts messages for the Ionian warriors who might come there. These messages urged the Ionians to fight with the Greeks or else not to fight at all, pointing out to the Ionians that Greeks and Ionians were kinsmen and ought to be united against the Persians.

We find, too, that the old Hebrew prophet, Jeremiah, was against the policy being followed by his King's government. He made his opposition felt by telling the people that some of them would die by the sword, some by the famine and some by the pestilence, but that he that went forth to the Chaldeans should live. He said that the city should surely be given over into the hand of the King of Babylon and his army. This was plain talk and it was widely spread over the city. This was what we should call today "Propaganda against the War." And for this kind of propaganda Jeremiah suffered in much the same way as men who talked against the war and spread reports against it suffered in the various countries a few years back. His life was threatened and he was cast into a dungeon.

Indeed history is replete with such illustrations.

Propaganda has been used as far as we can learn by every great social, political and religious movement which the world has known.

But just what is propaganda? The Encyclopedia Britannica defines it as "a concerted scheme for the promotion of a doctrine or practice, more generally the effort to influence opinion." This is the Encyclopedia definition but possibly we can get at the real meaning to the average man by saying that the essence of it consists in the spreading of reports and deductions from them for the purpose of influencing public opinion and conduct. These reports, of course, may be true, partly true, or false. They may be by word of mouth or the printed word. They may spring from good motives or from bad. These things make no difference as far as our word is concerned. The word propaganda covers any deliberate effort to disseminate information for the purpose of influencing conduct in the direction desired by the propagandist. What then are the ethical principles involved in this practice?

First of all, it must be pointed out that much propaganda is false. It is untrue and misleading. Examples of this kind are the German atrocity stories, those yarns about the corpse factories and others of like ilk which were fed to the Allied peoples. In another field we find the so-called "Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion," circulated with the design of stirring up hatred against the Jews. Similarly we find the Ku Klux retailing stories of the murder of Harding by the Catholics and the Catholic propagandists circulating stories of fiendish atrocities committed by Mexican troops against the Catholic rebels. We have also the famous canard concerning the nationalization of women by the Soviet government. All these and dozens of others will come at once to your mind. Now progaganda of this kind must be condemned by all.

We say it must be condemned by all because no ethical system upholds lying. Lying propaganda is, of course, lying, and open to all the moral condemnation that the race has united in heaping upon it. Moses expressed our moral judgment upon this when he framed the ninth commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Of course, it is sometimes asserted that when one lies in war to bring victory to one's fatherland, or when one lies for the glory of one's religion, or when one lies to bring on a revolution which will restore to the people what is rightfully theirs, such lies are justifiable because they are told not for personal gain but for a great cause. This is a doctrine attractive to all of us in moments of great passion for a mighty cause, but it is nothing more than the seductive, alluring teaching that the end justifies the means. It is nothing more than the principle which made the Czar send his political foes to Siberia and made the Germans march through Belgium. It is a principle which has been used and often sincerely by every tyrant and dictator in the world's history. This doctrine can have no place in an ethical man's code. The end does not justify the means. To assert that it does means that a finite man has infinite knowledge of cause and effect. The acceptance of this doctrine in the field of propaganda or any other, means that there are no objective standards of conduct to which men can refer. We are thrown back upon the vague subjective purposes of each individual man, purposes which no one but the man himself can know. Lying propaganda must be condemned. Its ethics are the ethics of the lie, whether told for country, for religion or the social revolution.

But what about the propaganda that tells no lies, is most scrupulous, in fact, about that, but tells those truths only which favor our side and suppress those facts which favor the other side? Here again the same rule holds. These half truths may be as deadly as lies, sometimes more so. When gas was first used in the Great War the propaganda of each side stressed the use of it by the other. In the sinking of the Lusitania British propaganda emphasized the attack upon the merchant ship containing innocent women and children, but it suppressed completely the rather pertinent fact that the ship carried munitions designed to kill German soldiers. In the same way the propaganda for the Soviet will stress what it is doing for the education of the children and neglect to mention the political prisoners languishing in the prisons of Russia. So it goes. Propaganda may be made up of nothing untrue and yet may not give a true picture. Honest men must condemn this just as much as that which lies more deliberately. Such propaganda cannot be defended from the ethical standpoint.

However, very few would care to uphold the ethical soundness of propaganda which distorts and misleads. This is not the real difficulty. There is a deeper question. It is concerned with the ethics of that propaganda which does not distort or mislead, but does seek to influence the conduct of others by circulating facts and arguments in such a way that men and women will believe what it is to the interest of the propagandist to have them believe. This is the situation in a truthful advertisement. This is the situation in the political field when an honest politician seeks an office and carries on a campaign to win it. This is the situation with many organizations today which seek what we call publicity. What about cases of this kind?

The answer is not easy; yet it is not impossible. Granted that what is said is true and no vital facts are suppressed, the question narrows down to this: Are the persons responsible for the propaganda merely interested in their own advantage at the expense of the social good or have they the interest of their fellows at heart? If they are merely interested in them-

selves and their own well being and are simply manipulating the public for their own ends, then their propaganda, too, is to be condemned. It is to be condemned because it is fundamentally selfish rather than social in its purpose. It is to be condemned because it is the manipulation of one's fellows for one's own ends. In other words, the test here is whether the motive is rooted in the desire to take advantage of others or whether it proceeds from an honest desire to help them.

Let us pass on to another type of case and one which concerns us more—I refer to the propaganda carried on by men and institutions which have nothing to sell, no money to make and no reputation to be gained, but who seek to influence public opinion, who seek to change men's beliefs and conduct because they honestly believe they will thereby benefit their fellows. In this class we must place the sincere communist who would win the world to communism; we have the honest socialist who would persuade the world of socialism. In this class, too, we have the sincere vegetarian who would teach men to live on a meatless diet and the convinced anti-vaccinationist who would abolish compulsory vaccination. In this same category, too, falls the true Moslem who would win the world for Mohammedanism and the sincere Theosophist who would win the world for theosophy. What about all these and scores of other movements which seek, we assume, in the spirit of truth to convert men to their point of view? Is this propaganda ethical? Our answer is yes. But to this we see one exception. That exception is found in that type of honest propaganda which bulldozes people to such an extent as to force them to accept what they do not want. If the methods of propaganda compel rather than persuade, if they do violence to personality rather than respect it, then even here the ethical ground is shaky. But if such propagandists are sincere and they speak the truth because, loving their fellows, they want them to have the good which they themselves have found, then not only are they ethically justified, but ethically compelled to publish the glad tidings which they have found.

Here, then, is the way the matter sums up: If we define propaganda as any spreading of information in a systematic way for the purpose of influencing the opinion and conduct of others, then the ethical problem involved is two-fold. First, concerning propaganda which is untrue. This we must condemn unsparingly, no matter how noble is the cause it seeks to further. The acceptance of any other principle means the negation of all morality. Second, as regards propaganda which is true, the answer is less simple. Here the motive must be considered.

If the propagandist merely seeks his own interest and through his knowledge of human psychology manipulates men and women for his own ends, then his conduct is open to the ethical condemnation which any pure selfishness merits. Moreover, it transgresses that greatest of all ethical principles which Emanuel Kant expressed in the command never to treat human beings merely as means and not as ends in themselves. Such propaganda must also be condemned.

But where the propagandist has as his controlling motive the good of his fellows and uses the truth only and that truth in such a way as not to bulldoze, or overawe or violate the personality of another, then his propaganda is justified. Yes, more than justified. We believe it is a positive duty on the part of every man who believes he has found some truth, something that will help his fellows either in science, politics, religion or anything else vital to human welfare, to get that truth accepted. Such a propagandist was Buddha as he and his disciples taught the way to spiritual peace. Such a propagandist was Plato, as he taught men the delights of philosophy. Such a propagandist was Savonarola as he called men to more righteous living and thundered against the tyrants of his day. Such a propagandist was Lincoln as he worked against slavery and for the preservation of the Union. Such supremely was Jesus as he went up and down preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God and sending forth his followers to persuade men that they were indeed sons of God.

Against lying propaganda, no matter for what worthy cause, let us hurl our condemnation; for the propaganda which distorts through the suppression of some truths and the over emphasis of others let us have contempt, for true propaganda which is wholly selfish let us withhold our approval, and even for that true unselfish propaganda which violates the personality of men let us be very suspicious. But for that propaganda which is motivated by honest desire to help one's fellows and which is conducted with scrupulous regard for the truth and in the spirit of respect for others let us reserve our approval and our admiration. Through such propaganda has come many of the greatest advances in the welfare of men. Through such propaganda slavery was abolished, woman suffrage was won, and the growth in temperance effected. To everyone who sees a truth, who is convinced he has something for his fellows that will make them better and happier, there comes the command like to that which Jesus gave his disciples, "Go ye unto all the world and preach . . . ." In him there must burn the conviction which flamed in the mind of that great Jew, Saul of Tarsus, "Woe to me if I preach not the good news."

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.

Jottings

The Linwood Christian Church, of Kansas City, the famous church headed by Dr. Burris Jenkins, has just changed its name to "The Community Church." Dr. Jenkins has long been a leader in the movement from denominationalism to church unity, and he finds, as UNITY has found, that the community church movement is the open road.

Forty-eight cadets at West Point were recently dropped for failure to keep up in their studies. One of the forty-eight was a Negro, and his name was published in every newspaper in the country; the other forty-seven were whites, and no newspaper thought it worth while to print their names. Obviously, it is news for a Negro to fail. But it is so commonplace for white men to fail that nobody is interested.

The American, French and English soldiers of occupation in Germany, now happily withdrawn, have left behind them 15,000 illegitimate children. We can't seem to decide whether this is primarily a tribute to German womanhood, or to American, French and English manhood. In either case, or in both cases, it is a ghastly revelation of the essential character of war and the military life.

When we get tired of reading crazy remarks by theologians, we find relief in reading equally crazy remarks by scientists. No theologian ever said a crazier thing about the virgin birth or the resurrection than Dr. Heyl, physicist of the U. S. Bureau of Standards, when he declared recently that life is a chemical compound, and may some day be reproduced synthetically in the laboratory.

Chicago is to give $25,000 annually in prizes to poets, novelists and historians who write and publish their books in Chicago. It is evident that the lake city believes in pens—authors' as well as stockyards'!

The latest form of hysteria in the United States is "parrot fever." This will undoubtedly be followed by "canary chills" and "sparrow spasms." What this country would do without a disease fad we can't imagine.

J. H. H.

The Value of a Liberal Church to the Community

The medieval idea of the church identified it with the community. The church was one of the forms of the organization of society. To be outside the church was to be outside of, or in rebellion against, society itself.

At first the Protestant reformation in no wise denied this idea of the church. Membership in the state was identified with membership in the church. The king inherited a divine power which had been accredited to the Pope. To be his subjects meant also to be members of his church. The Reformation, however, could not ignore the idea of direct relationship with God which had been the basis in the past of many revolts against the church. Out of this idea of personal relationship with God there grew up the idea of the church being a group of saved people. The church was a community within society, a faint imitation of the heaven that was to be the reward of all true believers. It meant the separating on earth of the good from the bad. The church was an organization within society.

Over and against these two ideas, there has grown up during the past one hundred years the idea of a free or liberal church. Such a church is a group of people united for the purpose of upholding and interpreting those ideals which they believe are essential to the realization of the highest and most abundant life for men. Membership in such a church is not an affirmation of a belief in the truth of certain doctrines or of personal goodness. It is an affirmation of the worth and power of ideals in themselves. The writer of the Gospel of St. John had this thought in mind when he put in the mouth of Jesus these words: "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." This is an expression of faith in the inherent power of an ideal to reach and touch the hearts of men and women.

There are two forms of force in the world, one physical and the other spiritual. Physical force is a compelling external power. Spiritual force relies upon its appeal to the inner life of men. It carries with it the testimony of its own values. A liberal church is centered about the affirmation of the worth and power of ideals in themselves. Its mission is to discover and to reveal to men those ideals which will contribute to a richer and a more abundant life for individuals and to assist them in attaining a harmonious, cooperative, and progressive community life,—a better social order.

If it turns from this high task for the sake of immediate ends it fails.

We face today a world in which there is injustice, misery, and suffering: a world in which greed, vanity and petty ambitions prevail. The world today is small, and cries of agony reach our souls from every land. The little children are hungry; women are weary; and men tremble under the threat of war. There is temptation on every hand to seek in the name of the church some remedy,—to find some social or political program that will bring peace and plenty to a tired and weary world.

A church in order to develop any social or political program must first agree upon a plan of action. There are many of these furnished ready to hand.

The single taxer, the socialist, the anarchist, the communist, the money reformer, and a host of others present their programs, each group trying to convince us that its particular program is the one that will save the world. If a liberal church is to undertake a social or political program, it must of necessity be convinced that that one program is preferable to all the others. If the reformers cannot agree among themselves, it is hardly possible to expect that the members of the church will come to an agreement on any one program. In the attempt to honestly decide what is the best or the right program a church would inevitably resolve itself into a number of groups each attempting to convert the other to its way of thinking.

But if the impossible should happen, if agreement by some miracle could be attained, the church would cease to exist. Instead of coming to men with a group of ideals of life challenging the souls of men, it would have a social or political program, a program that could only be put in force by a denial of the essential value of ideals and a resort either to physical force expressed in a revolution or by obtaining the majority of votes. Such a program would, of necessity, be full of compromises and limitations. Whatever idealism might be lingering within it would vanish into thin air.

If the single tax program was adopted, the church would cease to be a church and become a single tax club. No longer would it be an organization holding before men and women challenging ideals, calling them to the highest service, each with a sense of his or her own personal responsibilities. The ideal of freedom would disappear and in its place would appear social dogma, fast and rigid. No longer would its appeal be to those who in the spirit of freedom and love of truth seek the way of rich and fuller life. The call would be: "Come all ye single taxers to our fold." All others would be anathema. We do not object to single taxers forming a single tax club, or a group within the church forming such an organization. Those who do so voluntarily associate themselves together for the purpose of putting into concrete form a particular program. They may have a social ideal which they sincerely believe would merit the commendation of men and women. But this association, I repeat, would not be a church and it would depend in the end not on the power of the ideal to put their program into action but upon securing a majority of votes.

The business then of a liberal church is primarily to deal with the fundamental ideals of life. These ideals that are born out of the white heat of the furnace of human experience and tested by the souls of men have come to be recognized as being basilar in the individual life and in the social life. The individual members may differ widely as to their particular applications. They may differ as to the comparative value of different ideals, but they are associated together in the faith of the inherent power of those ideals to appeal to the souls of men and women. Such an organization, being voluntary, would inevitably have within it members who would differ widely in their faith and devotion, but the very fact of membership is a testimony to some faith at least in the validity of the ideals for which the organization stands. A liberal church cannot dogmatize either about the value of any particular ideal or the amount of devotion which its members must show. Here again it must rest entirely in its trust in the moral power and spiritual persuasiveness of its own faith.

There is one ideal, however, which stands by common consent above all others and which is the dynamic power of a liberal church. It is only as this ideal is recognized that such a church can exist. It is the ideal of freedom which includes the idea of responsibility. This implies that every individual must for himself attain his own religion. This means, it is true, a diversity of definitions of religion, but it is in this diversity that we find the basis of all higher unity. In the agreement to disagree men find that close and intimate fellowship that transcends all uniformity founded on the pretense of intellectual agreement.

I say pretense because men can only pretend to intellectual agreement. Any agreement that professes to be intellectual is a denial of intellect. No two persons see the same rainbow; no two persons see the same world; no two persons see identically the same star with the most perfect telescope. No two persons live in exactly the same world. They, therefore, must see life from different points of view. But they can walk together on the open road in a joyful companionship each moved with an ardent desire to find the truth and each striving for the realization of his ideals of conduct and social progress as his vision commands him. This does not deny that for practical purposes men must unite for the realization of particular ends, but it does affirm that the spiritual life of man is conditioned upon his freedom. For it is in the soil of freedom that the tree of life is rooted. Only in such soil can it blossom and bear the fruits of a noble character.

That man's freedom is limited cannot be denied. But man's highest spiritual achievement lies in the maintenance of such freedom as he has, and in extending its domain as far as he possibly can. He cannot be bound to creed or dogma, for this means the enslavement of his own soul to a dead past. Freedom means facing the future, following the gleam, being led by the "light that never was on sea or land." Man's struggle for freedom is the condition of his spiritual progress. The ideal of freedom is a voice of God challenging the highest and holiest that lies within the human soul. As freedom is the goal of the spiritual life of the individual, it is also the goal of any social order. The upholding and interpreting of this ideal to men becomes a solemn and sacred duty of a liberal church.

The idea of an immortal life has been and is a powerful factor in the lives of men. But it loses its beauty and significance the moment it is confined within the bounds of any creed or identified with a particular heaven. Because one man finds his own idea of the immortal life satisfying and inspiring, it by no means follows that the same idea or even a very similar one will have meaning to another. But under all ideas of immortality there lies the idea of the supreme value of human life. It is this realization of the value of life that gives meaning and significance to any theory of immortality. It is life then that is the supreme concern of religion. Whatever the eternal life, if it is ever attained, we begin to live it here and now.

A liberal church recognizes that life is more than any man's interpretation of it; that its beauty and

worth transcends all else; that its chief task is to help men to discover the conditions of the richest and fullest life.

The liberal church must emphasize the ideal of love, for love is the condition of living together in freedom. It cannot prescribe a form or manner of loving. But it can affirm that the law of love is the fundamental law of life; make known that the love of truth,—even the love of the search for truth—is the condition of rising out of our lower into our higher selves.

It is fundamentally important that the ideal of full and rich life for all be our goal. It is through association with others that we reach our highest development. By that fact we become dependent upon others. The fact that others give to us makes it imperative that we give to them. So the ideal arises of a cooperative democratic life in which we are mutually responsible. This means that no one can move forward alone. We tread the upward path together; the weakness of one becomes the weakness of all. It is because of this that we affirm that little helpless children should not be exploited by those who are moved by greed for gain. This is the basis of our protest against the weaving of their bodies and souls into the warp and woof of cotton cloth. Our respect and reverence for life denies the right of anyone to use the life of another for his own mere personal advantage. Under its stimulating appeal we affirm that all the children of all the people shall have an opportunity for the fullest and the richest life. But this does not mean that every member of the church shall agree that the passage of the Federal Child Labor Amendment is the only or even the highest means to that end. As to the practical means there must always be great differences of opinion. But the ideal must always be upheld if we are true to ourselves.

We must remember that the moment we insist that any ideal is to be identified with a particular action,—that in its attainment there is only one way, one road, one means,—the ideal itself vanishes as mist before the rising sun. It only has power through us as we trust its own inherent power to appeal to the hearts of men. This implies our faith in men: that they will seek each in his own way the means for the realization of the ideal. The business of a liberal church is not to convert men and women to a particular plan or method of action but rather to fit them for life, keeping the high faith that they will find in other organizations than the church,—political, social, industrial, the opportunities they seek. Such a position is not a confession of weakness but an affirmation of power. It implies a high trust and a deep faith in the value of the spiritual realities as motive powers in human progress and a deep and unfaltering trust in the capacity of men to respond to their appeal.

The dynamic driving force in humanity has always been the projection of men's best into the future.

If one man with an ideal appears in a city, he immediately becomes, or his ideal becomes a force with which all men and all existing institutions must reckon. If his ideal has in it so much of truth that ultimately all must see something of value in it though he may never convert anyone to his ideal as he sees it, he will draw men unto him in some measure. Years ago Pobedonostzev, reactionary procurator of the Holy Synod of the Greek Russian Church, testified to the truth. He justified his program of oppression by saying, "There is more explosive power in an ideal than in all the dynamites in the world."

The Declaration of Independence was, when adopted, the expression of an ideal. It was a dream of brave men. It belonged to the future and not to the present. It had no actuality in any nook or corner of the world, and yet it became the most potent and driving force in the life of America. When adopted we had slavery and there was no consent of the governed worthy of the name. But lifted into the stars it became a drawing power that no man could deny or ultimately withstand. Under its compelling appeal slavery was abolished, suffrage for men and women became realities. There were vast differences of opinion as to the means by which these ends should be obtained but the same fundamental ideal was challenging men and women and also driving them on. Today this ideal is calling us to high endeavor as it has for the past one hundred fifty years. Around it centers the spiritual reality we call America. We can never utterly neglect or deny it. It is the most potent power in our social and political life. An ideal, yes, but an ideal with enough potency to mark the path of our progress into the future.

A church which upholds the ideal of God as the symbol of the unity and co-operation of mankind in seeking for the fulness of life is dealing with a dynamic force that no man can measure. In the presence of which the church itself with its individual members sinks into insignificance. It is an ideal that always has and always will tremendously affect the lives of men and women.

Thus it is that the importance of a church is not measured by what it does but what it seeks to do. Its power is not within itself but within its ideal. It is this that gives the church driving power and makes it significant in the life of a community.

I have said that the ideals of a liberal church could not be held as dogma. To have significance they must be held in freedom. They are never static, they are always growing. They are the products of human life in association. They grow out of our common experience. The validity of any man's ideal is tested in his association with others. It is in our association with fellow seekers that we find our own ideals growing and developing.

"No man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself."

The ideals of life to which the liberal church gives allegiance have been discovered by humanity in its long upward struggle. They have been tested in the fiery furnace of men's experience. Just as we know that this is the world in which two and two make four so we know that personal integrity is the essence of a social order. On the basis of such experience which testifies to the reality of our inner experience we know that the ideals of freedom, truth, righteousness, mercy, and peace, must always be a compelling challenge to man if he is to live wisely, richly and abundantly. A liberal church upholds these ideals because of the inner conviction of men that ideals must always be the goals of human endeavor, the stirring and stimulating forces in human progress.

It is true that such a church must bring in some

way courage and hope and a deeper sense of the values of life to its individual members. They must find in their association together, if the church itself is to exist, that it lifts them from the earth and sends them out into illimitable spaces of the future. They must find in it that which gives them comfort, consolation and courage. It must help them to a vision of a fairer and a more beautiful world. It must stir them to deeds of love and mercy and righteousness. But it is to be remembered that this, important as it is, is not the great work of a liberal church. Its members cannot for one moment think of it primarily as an institution out of which they get something. For if it is to have virile power in society its members must be primarily associated together, because it gives them an opportunity to assist in the task of holding aloft these fundamental ideals of life. They together must feel the opportunity of sharing in the creative process. It is to give but not to receive that we are associated in a liberal church. It is in the association of ministers and people together that the church becomes a powerhouse, tapping sources of infinite energy. In this realization they become something more than custodians of light. They are revealers of the light. Such a church in a community is to be valued not in terms of numbers but in terms of its high calling. Not what it is but what it seeks to be is a measure of its worth. But above all, its value lies in what it seeks to reveal of truth and righteousness to the world. Its significance is that it proclaims a way of life. Its value lies in the spiritual forces entrusted to its charge. The value of such an institution to any community, no man can measure. Such values as these belong to the order of life and passes the understanding of men.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Trumpets on New Horizons

In Their Own Image

I know what a Girder looks like,
I have heard a Rivet screaming
Night and day for years unending,
I have seen the God Wheels grinding
Certain as a death is certain,
Until death and ever after—
Piling like a clock that's ticking
Till they blind the light of daytime,
Till they hide the night of starshine,
Till the moon is buried snugly
In the tombed and quarried city—
And the universe is nothing
To a *wheel* forever turning!
Making a darkness ever darker,
Making a tomb forever deeper,
Making the ways that men will walk in
Ever farther away from living.

Making a bit of tinsel maybe
To bind a lovely breast for an evening,
Calico for a decent mother
To hide a bit of skin from a neighbor
To cover a bit of life for a moment.

Making an ugly strip of paper
Out of a tree no man has planted
Out of a tree that is older surely
Than the *Girders* and *Rivets* and *God Wheels Grinding.*

Out of a tree that is gone forever

Grinding an ugly waste of paper
To rivet a tomb that is ever deeper
To scream to a world that is never minding
Another lover has killed a lover!
A wheel has ticked another murder
And another girder perhaps has fallen.

I have seen the God Wheels grinding
Until death and ever after—

KATHLEEN MILLAY.

My Ego

Of all the Egoists I know
(Including my most hearty foe)
Who for Self-love make ardent plea—
Not one's *big* I can match my *me.*

I see my soul in every eye;
I hear my heart in each heart's cry;
I feel myself in every me;
My ego is all humanity.

I perish with the men who die
On gory fields that shame the sky;
Yet though I leave my flesh behind
My soul survives in humankind.

I triumph in each fair success;
Find joy in all men's happiness;
I let the world flow into me;
I'm not a river; I am the sea!

I'll wipe a tear from my world's eye;
Enthrone a smile where reigned a sigh;
I'll help and give—not charity;
For I'll be doing that for me!

Oh, fellow men, if you'd but see
That we're mere parts of *one big me,*
We'd scrap arms, laws—at last be free,
And just be ruled by sympathy!

ELI GREIFER.

Ellis Island Episode

We read "All's Quiet on the Western Front"
And "Sergeant Grischa" by the fireside glow,
While Ernst Toller, who has come to show
The brutal side of war, we prod and hunt,
We cut his twelve month's *visa* down, we grunt
And give him three months' stay. Do we not know
This man of thirty-six has seeds to sow?
His "Transformation" pioneered, the brunt
Of passioned protest against brutal war;
His play, "Mass Men" re-echoed; "Hobbleman"—
A man emasculated and his doom;
While "Hopla" bares new Munich to the core.
He tops the playwright world. He knew the ban
Of prison . . . sentence . . . firing squad. The loom
Of fate was kindly. Men refused to fire,
Because a poet, young . . . an ardent dreamer
Was not a traitor, not a selfish schemer.
He spent six years in prison. Swallows mire
Their snug clay nests beneath jail eaves, inquire
At prison windows; swallows saved his reason,
Cheered summer days, returned the coming season.
The jailors, grudging cheer would oust them . . . tire
And go their way. The nests were made . . . remade
And Ernst Toller's tottering reason spared.
All this is ten long years ago. Why wade
Into this war-time past? If Munich cared . . .
But Munich has forgiven. Pull the shade.
He voiced a protest all sane men have shared.

MARGARETTE BALL DICKSON

Law and Progress

Glancing over the issue of UNITY for September 9, 1929, just now, I noted, more particularly than upon my first reading of it, the letter from Mr. Charles R. Eckert, which was entitled, by the editor, I presume, "Against Prohibition." The reference in this letter to "the Editor-in-Chief's nonsense on Prohibition" as "about on a par with Mr. Bryan's anti-evolution nonsense," seemed to me curiously characteristic of "liberals" when they are dealing with those who are more orthodox than themselves. The orthodox are intolerant enough, as I have had occasion to realize in my own experience many times since I became identified with radicalism, but on the whole they seem to me much more sympathetic in judgment than are many of the self-appointed champions of tolerance, especially those of the anti-Prohibition sort. The severity with which these folks hand out such epithets as "nonsense," "folly," "hypocrisy," etc., etc., is in curious contrast with their own alleged "liberalism."

However, let this pass, for the purpose of this article is not to set intolerance against intolerance, or criticism against criticism, but to examine briefly and sympathetically the serious issue which is raised in the more studied portions of the letter, and especially in the quotation from Dr. Charles F. Dole. The quotation from Dr. Dole is introduced with these words, "A sentence, I recall at this moment, which reveals the folly of the gospel of force which is inherent in all prohibitive legislation is: 'The Pharisee never sees that the reservoirs of life are shut off as soon as we try to force our morals, our Christianity, our democracy on the unwilling and the unready.'" Mr. Eckert comments, in expansion of this quotation, as follows: "The police force of the land is animated with the spirit of force and after thirty-five years of close contact with courts and their proceedings I am persuaded that the same spirit is in about a so-called Court of Justice. For real progress let us not rely on Law Enforcement."

Mr. Eckert raises a real issue here, and one concerning which many men and women of the finest type are coming to feel much as he does. The moderation of his statement concerning police and court offsets his impatience toward the editor of UNITY, and indicates an attitude of sincere and thoughtful solicitude as to our present tendencies in governmental conceptions which calls for more than merely casual consideration. Dr. Dole's utterance which he cites adds to the importance of the challenge made.

In general, liberals of our day who are opposed to reliance upon law enforcement for real progress seem to be unaware of the pioneering on this line which was done centuries ago by a certain man from Tarsus, "a citizen of no mean city," the apostle Paul. He is not in very good repute with the progressives of our time, who blame him for the twist he gave organized Christianity in the direction of institutionalism and legalism. Yet his central teaching, so bitterly opposed by the institutionalists and legalists of his time that he was compelled to confess, "after the way that is called heresy so worship I the God of my fathers," was precisely this doctrine of the repudiation of law, or, if you will, dependence upon law. As one who had grown up with the most rigid regard for Jewish law, and who had prided himself on being a citizen of Rome, the contemporary champion of whatever legalism lay outside of the field of authoritative revelation, Paul had come to the conviction that they were both alike failures, and that love, and love only, was the way of salvation for the world. His revolutionism at this point, whether approved or not, deserves a far wider recognition than it has among either the conservatives or the liberals of our day.

Yet, historically considered, his contention was a failure. Christianity went the way of institutionalism and legalism, whether the actual course of its development was fortunate or not. Nor do we get away from the force of the logic of life itself if we contend, on the one hand, that Christianity was corrupted by pagan thought, or on the other hand, that like all other idealisms it responded to the compulsions of economic circumstance. The fact which stands out is that from the viewpoint of human experience such progress as we have made has been within the orbit of law, and of law most vigorously and often quite viciously enforced.

When we say, as we often do in these days, that "men cannot be made good by law," we are talking philosophy and not history. As a matter of actual experience morality is, whether good or bad, the outcome of the "mores," that is, the customs of the time and place, and particularly those customs which have the weight of legal enactment and enforcement behind them. These, and neither religion nor philosophy, have been the chief controlling agencies of every civilization. The inhibitions of established order, resting upon foundations of circumstantial situation and interest, have made each society what it has been, and neither prophecy nor martyrdom has prevailed against them, except as these were supported by changed circumstance and interest, and were able to embody themselves in authoritative custom and law. The whole liberal philosophical concept of progress is a dream, without factual support. Men never have been made good except by law; natural law manifesting itself in material circumstance expansively, and statute law recognizing and enforcing this enlarged perception of "things as they are."

We are all children of law. If the law, as Paul contended, is "our schoolmaster," to bring us to the Christ of a higher devotion, that is to the operation of liberty, the statement must be taken with the earlier statement credited to Jesus, that "not one jot or one tittle of the law shall pass till all are fulfilled." We never get out from under law; all that we do is to learn a better understanding of law as it operates in individual and social experience and a wiser conforming of statutory law to the compulsive order of life itself. Gravitation is not open to the appeal of moral suasion. Neither are the less obvious operations of cause and effect in the dealings of men with the imperatives of any and every circumstance. What is open to moral suasion is our consent to recognize law, and to make our social enactments, man-made law, conform to a larger and larger harmony with natural law. All other liberty is a delusion and a snare.

That in this program of building social regulation into unity with the sequences of life itself we blunder

prodigiously is not to be denied. The present dealing with the liquor traffic is a case in point. But there is no more reason for thinking that the liquor traffic can be dealt with effectively in relation to all the circumstances of our time by moral suasion as a substitute for formal enactment of social regulation than there is in an appeal for moral suasion as the sole determinant as to which side of the highway automobiles may use. The actual determinant of social advantage and disadvantage is in the mechanics of highway traffic, whether we recognize those mechanics or not. Prohibition has been found necessary at this point, as at a thousand other points of human contact in our highly energized and intricately involved society. The necessity is in the order of things themselves; it is only adjustment to the facts which is within the range of our refusal or consent. Emerson's calm "I accept the universe," meets very appropriately the sharp retort of the Scotch philosopher, Carlyle, "Gad, ye'd better!" And the universe moves by law, without waiting for our wish processes to come up to the region of consent.

All this is consistent with reasonable question as to whether social regulation is not too much involved in official inconsiderateness and want of character. But to argue against the effort to "enforce our morals" is to talk wishfully rather than factually. "Mores," morals, have never been removed from social enforcement, have never been individually voluntary.

Neither has democracy ever been a matter of individual consent, but always, in the measure in which it has prevailed, of social regulation, and regulation which has had to be prohibitive of special privilege, prohibition too often very poorly enforced. As to Christianity, or any other religion, whatever of love it has taught has been of little consequence except as it has been co-ordinated with natural law on the one hand, and crystallized into social law on the other hand. The trouble with Pharisaism is not its appreciation of law; it is its substitution of the incidental and the inconsequential in law for those large social adjustments which seek to guarantee equity between man and man.

Law and enforcement are of the very essence of the natural order. They are also of the very essence of social progress. In the fields of natural forces our times are distinguished for their apprehension of nature's laws, and for effective co-operation with them in our own fixed processes. Edison's electric light is a co-ordination of law with law. The law of its fabrication as an instrument corresponds with the law of its utilization by the power which we call electricity. Science does not seek to abolish law, but to apprehend it over wider fields, and makes more perfect, and more multitudinous adjustments to it. In the field of social forces we are as yet very ignorant of cause and effect, of the processes by which things proceed either toward beneficent or catastrophic ends. Hence, our ways are inharmonious and ineffective. But liberty has no different field in the one case than the other, except to find out fact, and bring action into harmony with it.

We are not suffering from too much prohibition, but from too little of it; because we are allowing social arrangements to lag behind the imperatives of social law. Our prohibitions are often wrongly directed, against the many rather than the few, against the protection of all and for privilege to the self-interested and the self-willed. There is nothing wrong in force, it is of the very order of life. Even materialism is not the fault. We need "the word made flesh." It is misdirected law, misdirected prohibition, misdirected force that queers the day.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

The Study Table

Book Reviews by John Haynes Holmes

Conscientious Objectors in the Great War

The literature of conscientious objectors in the Great War of 1914 is not abundant, but is curiously impressive. It began in England, while the War was still on, with the publication in 1917 of Mrs. Henry Hobhouses's thrilling pamphlet, "I Appeal Unto Caesar," with introduction by Professor Gilbert Murray. The movement of rebellion against war, of which this pamphlet was a cry in the hour of agony, found its permanent historical record five years later, in 1922, in Principal Graham's "Conscription and Conscience," the most elaborate work which has been written on the subject.

In this country the history of the movement has been written by Norman Thomas in his excellent book, "The Conscientious Objector in America" (1923), later revised and reprinted under the title, "Is Conscience a Crime?" (1927). A most important volume, from the standpoint especially of official data, is Walter Guest Kellogg's "The Conscientious Objector" (1919). Major Kellogg was a member of the President's Board of Inquiry during the War, and thus came into direct official contact with the whole problem. Another book, "Mennonites in the World War" (1921), was published by the Mennonite Church, as a permanent record of the heroism of their young men who refused, in the face of torture and threatened death, to take up arms.

Now comes another book,* different from all those which have preceded it. Titled with the contemptuous phrase that the conscripts yelled derisively at the C. O.'s, as they passed them by in street or camp, this book is "the war diary of a Conscientious Objector." So at least the title-page describes it! But the "diary" is only part of the volume. Along with this are letters written from camp or prison to the author's wife, Meta, whom, with a somewhat conscious and awkward pose, he insists upon calling "comrade." There are also fascinating autobiographical passages of narrative or inward meditation interspersing the diary and letters, and some later chapters written since the War which give admirable perspective. The whole presents an unforgettably vivid, almost painfully clear, picture of what it meant in 1917-1918 to stand out against the war insanity in this country, especially when one was caught in the trap of the military.

Mr. Meyer was a student in the University of Wisconsin when the United States entered the World War. Embarrassed by his German parentage, he got

*"Hey! Yellowbacks," by Ernest L. Meyer with Foreword by William Ellery Leonard. Published by the John Day Company. $2.

no sympathy from his Alma Mater in his revolt against conscription. On the contrary, his academic mother turned against him like a ferocious tigress and expelled him in disgrace. Seized by a no less merciless government, after a hasty marriage, he was hauled away to Camp Taylor in Kentucky, where he was treated with little sheer physical cruelty, but with a contempt and ridicule, frequently breaking out into insult, which seared the soul. Yet kindness was not lacking, as in the case of the cook to whose mercies he was committed by the brutal sergeant. But his isolation was complete, and boredom and later on idleness were torture to flesh and spirit.

In August, he was taken to Camp Sherman, in Ohio, for trial before the Board of Inquiry. Brought promptly before Dean Stone (now a justice of the Supreme Court), Mr. Meyer was very properly classified as "a political objector," and very improperly condemned therefore as insincere and worthy of extreme punishment. Then followed a long period of stagnation, while his case lingered on appeal in Washington. In late September, however, came the order to entrain for Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, for imprisonment.

Arrival at Leavenworth was almost immediately followed by transfer to Fort Riley, Kansas, where he was kept in the barracks until after the Armistice. Here he was given another hearing, this time before Major Kellogg of the Board of Inquiry. Later still, he was sent to Camp Grant, in Illinois, for still a third hearing, this time before the third member of the Board, Judge Julian Mack. Mr. Meyer thus appeared before all the members of the Board before he got through. The government apparently could not get these Conscientious Objectors off its own conscience! At last, in December, 1918, he was released, on Judge Mack's wise and merciful recommendation that he be sent to join the Quaker Reconstruction Unit in France.

Our author, although a political objector, chanced to spend most of his time with religious objectors. His description of these queer young men, members of outlandish Christian sects of various kinds, is the most important, as it certainly is the most interesting, portion of his book.

> Our roster (he writes at Camp Sherman) is as varied as the roll-call of the nations who poured into Palestine. There are Mennonites, Molokans, Christadelphians, Plymouth Brethren, Adventists, Quakers, members of the Church of God (Holiness), Church of Christ, Pentecostal, Apostolic Faith, International Bible Students, and the House of David.

The Quakers, of course, were intelligently and highly trained men. Most of the others, however, were ignorant and superstitious, and with their constant Bible-reading and psalm-singing, intolerable bores. Yet they were patient, kindly, uncomplaining, and brave as lions, every one. They were of the stuff the Christian martyrs were made of in the early days. No contempt could anger them, no torture break them down. They suffered terribly from abuses of various degrees of horror. Yet there was no flinching, certainly no surrender. They would have died at any moment without a whimper.

It is interesting to read in this book of Mr. Meyer's initial impatience with the irritating innocences of these religionists, and then note, as the book goes on, how slowly but surely his impatience turned into admiration for the heroic fibre of which these C. O.'s were built. In the end he came to a rather profound understanding of them as compared, not unfavorably, with the political radicals of which he himself was one. "In the radical colony," he writes,

> . . . . we would be spinning webs of different materials and perhaps just as gray and tedious. The difference would be merely a difference in jargon, and maybe it is only because I am more familiar with the jargon of the radicals that I would feel happier there. Essentially all our aims are alike: we seek security amid a hostile universe, the religionist through individual salvation and the radical through social readjustment.

Over against the Conscientious Objectors in this book stand the military. It is a devastating comparison. There is not a particle of animosity in Mr. Meyer's writing. He has no bitterness within his heart, only pity for the men who were willing to be victims of such a system. Yet startling is his picture of the instant degeneracy that falls upon youth the very moment it is called to the colors. In his train-ride to the first cantonment, before military life had begun, the scene was "bedlam."

> Most of the men were drunk. All of them swore, sang, yelled obscenities through the windows at girls when the train halted at wayside stations. . . . The train was a load of confusion rolling on to a greater madness.

As for the officers who parade through this book—what brutes or turkey-cocks they are! All their brains gone—nothing but the emotions of fear, pride, and power left! And behind the soldiers, the government! One wonders that Washington could have been so distraught over these C. O.'s. Only 3,989 of them out of a grand total of 2,810,296 inducted men! Yet the government made fuss and feathers enough over them to fight a dozen battles. When one sees what these less than four thousand men did to the government in war time, one sees as well how four hundred thousand such men could completely paralyze the military arm.

"Hey! Yellowbacks" is beautifully written—in fine spirit, with much literary charm, and with a depth of feeling that touches the heart. It does for life behind the trenches in war-time very much what "All Quiet on the Western Front" does for life in the trenches. In both cases we have something like a classic of war literature.

An Anthology of Great Poets

Here is a book* which has brought me great delight. The material is familiar, for I know the Victorian poets through years of fond acquaintanceship. Just for this reason, perhaps, the volume has stirred my enthusiasm. For it brings evidence and proof that there were some men and women in the despised Victorian era who knew how to write great poetry. One would never imagine that this was true—to listen to our contemporary critics. These savants know only how to enthuse over living poets, usually of the free verse variety. Or, if they recognize anything of any worth in the past, they find it in the eighteenth or seventeenth centuries, but never in the nineteenth. But here this last century is given a chance to be heard again, and if there is lovelier poetry than this, I for one do not happen to know what it is.

The poets represented in this anthology are not

*"Certain Poets of Importance," Victorian Verse Chosen for Comparison. Compiled by Hattie Hecht Sloss. Published bp E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

NOVEL BY-WAY CRUISE THROUGH JAPAN

Directed by Dr. Frederick Starr, famous American traveler, anthropologist, writer and lecturer.

Sailing from Seattle on the S.S. "President Lincoln," March 22, 1930. Returning to Seattle on the SS. "President Grant," May 2, 1930.

AN INTRIGUING ORIENTAL ADVENTURE

See real Japan. Not only the highways but the by-ways, crammed with color, lighted at night with giant paper lanterns. Make pilgrimages to famous old hidden temples. Live and travel, during part of your stay in Japan, in truly native fashion, under the leadership of one who has spent thirty years in intimate study of Japanese life, art and customs. Rarely indeed is an opportunity of this kind possible.

Picture Yourself in the Orient

The native life of Japan differs so absolutely from ours in America as to be positively overwhelming. Picture yourself as a member of Dr. Starr's party in Japan in April next, —April, the most attractive month of all the year in the land of the Mikado and of the Rising Sun.

THE MAGIC COUPON

D. J. Hanscom, General Passenger Agent,
American Mail Line,
760 Stuart Building, Seattle, U. S. A.
Without incurring any obligation, I would appreciate further information about the By-Way Cruise to Japan.

Name .....

Address .....

THE WAR AGAINST ALCOHOL

The anti-alcohol movement made marked progress in practically every country in the world during 1929. The changing type of modern civilization, the increasing intensity of economic rivalries, as well as the growing appreciation of the needless ravage done by intoxicating beverages have been the more significant factors in this movement.

While prohibition has not been the immediate aim, the stricter regulation and more positive control of the beverage liquor traffic are commonly recognized as being steps toward ultimate prohibition.

Economic, sociological and health data seem to indicate a marked decrease in the consumption of illicit beverage intoxicants in the United States, corroborating the claims made by the Federal prohibition officials that the law is being more efficiently enforced.

But one must make the customary exceptions, however, in the cases of states like Maryland and New York and a few other wet centers. Even in these communities the growing observance of the law has decreased some of the difficulties of the enforcing agencies.

In Great Britain a royal commission has been appointed to study the revision of liquor legislation. The difficult economic problems faced by the nation have been so complicated by the expenditure of $1,500,000,000 for intoxicating beverages that those concerned about the industrial future of the country have been making more thorough studies of systems of control and regulation. Crime and excesses in general, due to drink, have been very marked in Great Britain.

Belgium has also appointed an extra parliamentary commission to revise the Belgian liquor laws because of their failure to prevent illicit sales of liquor or to check growing alcoholism.

Sweden has named a commission to study the modification of the Bratt System as a possible step toward ultimate prohibition.

Germany, which, according to many outstanding German leaders, may be the next great nation to adopt prohibition, has been attempting to work out the solution of her perplexing problems of liquor smuggling and moonshining. Local option legislation is the immediate goal toward which the friends of an alcohol-free civilization in Germany are working.

In Czechoslovakia, under the leadership of President Masaryk, total abstinence organizations are being officially encouraged.

Local option legislation has reduced the brandy consumption in Denmark to less than one-fifth of its former total. Estonia's new local option law went into force in 1929. Hungary has begun its restrictive legislation by adopting curfew laws and reducing the number of public houses.

Afghanistan has become prohibition by the edict of Nadir Khan, the newly enthroned king.

In China the Ministry of the Interior for the nationalized government has directed the provincial governments to issue proclamations requiring the citizens to abstain from alcoholic liquors. No punitive measures have been yet adopted for violation of this form of prohibition.

Under the auspices of President Emilio Portes Gil, an anti-alcohol movement beginning with increased taxes on alcoholic beverages, the support of anti-alcohologans and the obligatory dissemination of anti-alcohol information is working in Mexico toward the prohibition goal. Poland has adopted partial prohibition in many communities. This country appropriates 1 per cent of the proceeds from the state alcohol monopoly for the fight against beverage alcohol.

Bulgaria is planning a referendum on the closing of saloons in Sofia. The National Public Health Department is promoting total abstinence societies and requires temperance instruction in the schools.

Mussolini in a public statement, declared: "I have closed 27,000 saloons in five years. Give me time and I will close them all." The Italian government is officially issuing prohibition propaganda.

Plans proposed in the Rumanian parliament in 1929 suggest making this nation dry by 1937. The new Russian budget provides for a gradual decrease in the production of spirits from 528.9 millions of liters in the fiscal year 1928-29 to 504.3 for 1929-30, 479.7 for 1930-31, 418.2 for 1931-32 and 368.9 for 1932-33. The Swiss government uses a portion of the income from the taxation of alcohol for the support of a number of anti-alcohol organizations.

In Canada Nova Scotia has abandoned the partial prohibition which, under the dominion system of government, was all that was possible for an individual province. It has substituted

---

numerous, but they are exceeding choice. The list includes Matthew Arnold, Emily Bronte, Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning, Arthur Hugh Clough, Austin Dobson, William E. Henley, Charles Kingsley, William Morris, Coventry Patmore, Christina and Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Robert Louis Stevenson, Charles Algernon Swinburne and Alfred Lord Tennyson. What a galaxy of genius!

The editor's method is very simple. She has taken a list of definite topics, and then compiled under each topic what each of these poets has said. Eight groups represent the great divisions of the book—Children, Portraits, Music, Nature, Human Relations, Social Relations, and Spiritual Relations. Of these, Group V, *Nature,* is subdivided into Landscapes, Seascapes, Seasons, Plants and Animals. Group VI, *Human Relations,* includes Romantic Love, Husbands and Wives and Parents and Children. Group VII, *Social Relations,* presents Social Conditions, Nations, and War and Peace. The last Group, *Spiritual Relations,* has as sub-heads Youth, Old Age, Written in Later Years, Death, and Immortality.

With so few poets represented in so considerable a collection of material, the selections from each are abundant. The fault of most anthologies—scant fare from any one writer—is here almost completely avoided. What we have in this volume is the best of what these great poets have written on subjects of widest human interest and appeal. We can think of no better introduction to Arnold, Browning, Tennyson, Swinburne than the poems here assembled. As for writers like Kingsley, Morris, Patmore, we find in these pages what it is difficult to find elsewhere. Mrs. Sloss has done with fine skill and insight what was well worth doing. I commend her book without reserve.

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

FEBRUARY

Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.

Schumann & Co.
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

the government sale of intoxicating beverages.

These instances are merely typical of many similar ones in other countries. With the exception of a few countries such as Portugal and Greece, there seems to be a universal movement throughout the civilized world for the elimination of beverage alcohol as incompatible with our high-speed industrial civilization.

The moral issue on the one hand and the personal liberty plea on the other seem less persuasive either for or against prohibitory or restrictive legislation than the fact that there seems to be no safe place for beverage alcohol in our modern type of life.

—*Ernest H. Cherrington,* in the New York *Times.*

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK ON INDIA

Strongly endorsed by Tagore, Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Mrs. Besant, Presidents of the Indian National Congress, Indian Leaders of All Parties, practically the Whole Periodical Press of India.

INDIA IN BONDAGE

Her Right to Freedom and a Place Among the Great Nations
By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Pp. 556. 12 Illustrations. Price at Booksellers $4.00, by mail $4.10.
Lewis Copeland Co., Inc.
Publishers, 119 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y.

This book, just from the press in New York, was published a few months ago in India. The British Government, alarmed at its quick and great sale, suppressed it, and arrested its publishers. Practically all India answered by indignant protests. Mahatma Gandhi published an article in the book's defense, four columns in length.

No other word in our generation has been so universally acclaimed by the highest Indian authorities, as a true and just portrayal of India's civilization, life, and political conditions.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE the poet writes: "If Americans would know the true India, they cannot have a better guide than Dr. Sunderland. I regard his book as the best informed, most just and trustworthy that has come from any pen. A part of its high value is as an unanswerable reply to the misrepresentations in Miss Mayo's **Mother India.**"

MRS. ANNA BESANT writes: "Dr. Sunderland's powerful chapters should be read by everybody who would understand India."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says: "No other American is so widely known or so loved in India, as Dr. Sunderland, and this book gives eloquent testimony as to the reasons why."

THE PATRIKA, Calcutta's leading daily declares: "**India in Bondage** easily takes the first place among all the books on India in recent years."